The Times-Dispatch

Business Office.....914 E. Main Street.
South Richmond.....1020 Hull Street.
Petersburg Bureau....109 N. Sycamore Street
Lynchburg Bureau.....815 Eighth Street

BY MAIL. POSTAGE PAID	One Year.	Six Mos.	Three Mos.	One Mo.
Daily with Sunday	$6.00	$3.00	$1.50	.50
Daily without Sunday	4.00	2.00	1.00	.35
Sunday edition only	2.00	1.00	.50	.25
Weekly (Wednesday)	1.00	.50	.25	...

By Times-Dispatch Carrier Delivery Service in Richmond (and suburbs) and Petersburg—

	One Week
Daily with Sunday	15 cents
Daily without Sunday	10 cents
Sunday only	5 cents

Entered January 27, 1903, at Richmond, Va., as second-class matter under act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

SUNDAY, JUNE 23, 1912.

TAFT AND DEFEAT.

Broken on the wheel of one man's ambition, the Republican party goes to the country with the weakest candidate that it has ever offered to the American people for the presidency. With the white flag of defeat flying at half mast, the party which the great war swept into almost half a century of uninterrupted control goes down, wrecked on the shoal of internal dissensions and with its timbers rent by poor leadership and unpopular policies. The regular Republicans determined to die by their guns; they would not desert the organization, nor would they in the face of a rapidly widening chasm in the party desert their titular head. They realized that they stood at Waterloo and not at Armageddon. Hoping for resurrection upon some brighter day, they nevertheless named for their standard bearer in the coming campaign one whose record, whose personality, whose policies and whose platform attract defeat to him as the magnet draws the needle. He cannot command the waves of progressivism to recede, and they who calmly chose him know that he cannot.

The old Republican party, whose swan song floated upon the air last night, was the creature of the interests. It decayed because of the corruption of degeneracy which always accompany long leases of position and power. It betrayed the people; it exalted privilege. Its defeat blazed the way for new alignments and wiser policies. Its imperial disregard of the principles of democracy wrote its own death warrant. It lies prostrate and broken and its backbone is shattered. If the Democratic party chooses well its man with the sling, it cannot fail to fell to earth what is left of the Republican party.

The Roosevelt bolt has divided the Republican house, and it cannot stand if the Democrats seize their opportunity by nominating a progressive who can carry the independent vote of the nation. The nomination of any other type of man would not only be suicidal to the Democratic party, but it would constitute a betrayal of the American people, who now turn their eyes to the Democrats to lead them into the way of wise progressiveness. For such leadership the Democratic party is best fitted by its traditions and its principles, and for it the hour of opportunity is beginning to tick off its precious minutes.

GO FORWARD.

Roosevelt will leave Chicago defeated and discredited, but progressivism is not dead; not by any means. The vacillation and selfishness of their leader has disheartened, but not disrupted, the political protestants against Aldrichism and Taftism and standpatism. That spirit of revolt is nation-wide. The day of dividing has come, and multitudes in the valley of decision are answering the call or instinct of progress. Old battle-cries have lost their power, old leaders are unheeded, for the appeal of a larger vision has touched the people's heart.

Consider the division in Chicago! On one side were the men who had owned and ruled the Republican party since the war, and by means of the convention system they rule it still. But Roosevelt's army was not wholly Falstaffian. No one thinks of G. W. Perkins as Falstaff's valiant "Bull-Calf." Though not so young as once he was, Frank Munsey is not called "Mouldy," nor is Flinn known as "Wart," as Falstaff's soldiers were. No one wisely belittles Johnson, of California, even if Heney is a swash-buckler; nor is Hadley set down as a misty dreamer—solely because he comes from Missouri. No! The forces behind the movement which Roosevelt led are real and vital and powerful. If Roosevelt himself had been a high patriot, and not a mere office-seeking politician, Hadley could have been nominated. But when the acid test of renunciation was offered, the Colonel reneged, and the progressives lost their chance to control the Republican party.

As a result the standpatters and reactionaries will nominate Taft. The antagonism to Taft is as deep as it is wide. Under no conditions can he be elected; the progressives know this. They appreciate the insistence and the strength of the demand for a liberalized government. They grasp the basic fact that the people demand a fuller share in the political life of this country. And the people's demand will be gratified. That is why a third party is almost certain. Indeed, if the reactionaries control at Baltimore a third party is inevitable. If that party is formed under such conditions the success of the Democratic ticket will be gravely imperiled.

It is to avoid that danger that Mr. Bryan has taken up the fight against Judge Parker. Personally, Judge Parker is a high and honorable gentleman. No bitterness exists between him and Mr. Bryan, but the eyes of the country are on Baltimore, and to the country Judge Parker represents in bodily presence these very forces that, having controlled the Republican convention, are now trying to dominate Democratic deliberations.

To The Times-Dispatch Judge Parker would be an entirely acceptable temporary chairman. We would not give him up to personally gratify Mr. Bryan's wishes, if that was all that was at stake, but neither Mr. Bryan's nor Judge Parker's personal opinions are the issue. It is Parker's following that is causing the trouble. Parker is a flag that had better not be waved if the Democrats want to hold the West. That is why Mr. Bryan is objecting.

With a so-called reactionary as temporary chairman, with Clark or Harmon, or, perhaps, even Underwood, for nominee, a new party will actually be forced into existence by the folly of the old line organizations.

No gentlemen's agreements between leaders can sweep back the rising tide of popular demand for a freer government. No peanut politics or Tammany trades can throttle the great forward movement. But blind folly and invincible Bourbonism may serve to bind the Democratic party hand and foot, and cast it helpless before the Juggernaut of political revolution.

The former things have passed away. Will the Democratic party meet the new issues in the spirit of a new day and ride triumphant into power? Or will it fatuously cling to Tammany and the standpatters and—perish?

THE RICHMOND BREAD RIOT.

Writing of the "meat riots" that have broken out in some of the large cities, and are threatening to extend to others, the New York Nation says that they are notably women's affairs; that in most riots women have a hand, and that when they do go into that sort of thing they are much harder to handle than men, "because you never know what to expect of them." In an effort to sustain its assertion as to the uncertainty of the fair sex as a riotous proposition, the Nation meanders through history for illustrations and adduces some history which is neither history nor illustration.

A case in point is its allusion to the "bread riots in the South" in the early part of the War Between the States, which, it tells its readers, started in Mobile and ended in Richmond. We know nothing as to the cycle of this demonstration, if cycle there was; but we do know that as to what occurred in Richmond the Nation constructs considerable of a fairy story.

It says that by the time the uprising reached Richmond it had become so clamorous that neither the Mayor nor the Governor felt able to cope with it by peaceful discussion, and a body of troops were ordered out. Jefferson Davis, however, having a keener sense of human weakness than the local functionaries, was able to disperse the mob in five minutes, and without firing a shot. Using the inconsistency of women passing with well-stocked market baskets, and their looting of jewelry and millinery shops while raising the city for bread, "he routed with sarcasm a mob that had vaunted its contempts for powder and ball." There is just enough truth in all this to be misleading and to obscure the salient facts. Mr. Davis could not cope with the situation, and, out for the "local functionaries," the riot, which was started by Northern emissaries and spies, might have resulted more harrowingly.

John Letcher, War Governor of Virginia, at the head of the Public Guard, the "Standing Army" of the Commonwealth, appeared on the scene at the critical moment. Mounting upon a country cart near the First Market, the central point of danger and violence, he drew out his old "bull's eye watch," gave the mob three minutes to disperse, and instructed Captain Edward S. Gay, commander of the Guard, "to load, and load with ball cartridges." With tears streaming down his rugged cheeks, Captain Gay promptly obeyed. The mob dispersed; they knew Letcher; they knew Gay; they knew the Guard. Speeches were made by Mr. Davis and others to groups at several other places in the lower part of the city, but Letcher, Gay and the Guard, the organization of which traced back to 1801, had in three minutes broken the backbone of the outbreak. That all who recall the conditions at the time and the influence behind the mob are well aware, neither the satire nor the eloquence of Mr. Davis, or any one else, could have accomplished. It was a question of bullets and bayonets, and these would have been served instead of the bread demanded, but not needed, had the rioters not dispersed within John Letcher's time limit.

The Guard, it may be interesting to note in conclusion, was organized in direct consequence of Gabriel's insurrection, but incidentally traced back to the acts of the General Assembly for the establishment of three arsenals, one on the western side of the Alleghanies and two on the eastern side. One of the latter was the old State Armory at the foot of Fifth Street in this city, and which, it was also designated, must be a manufactory of arms. The other was situated at Lexington, and was the genesis of the Virginia Military Institute. The proposed trans-Alleghany arsenal was never established.

The several acts grew out of the Alien and Sedition laws and embodied the spirit and the apprehensions of the resolutions of 1798-99. The Public Guard did sentinel duty at the armory, at the penitentiary, around the State property in the Capitol Square, constituted Richmond a military, in a way a garrison city, before the war, and, from the date of its formation to its disbandment under the reconstruction regime, was the military bulwark of the peace and dignity of the Commonwealth. It had no code save that of obeying orders. The ostensible reason for its disbandment was that its existence was contrary to the Constitution of the United States—a question that had never before been raised during its existence. The real reason was that when the then reconstruction Governor undertook to supersede Captain Gay with one of his myrmidons the captain demanded a court-martial, which might have placed the Federal authorities in a very awkward position as to their claims and contradictions touching Virginia's relations to the Union. The Guard was never legally abolished by act of the Legislature, but was put out of existence by cutting off its pay.

ALDERMEN SHOULD DELIBERATE.

The Board of Aldermen of this city will next have an opportunity to weigh the merits of the light and power franchise sought by the Richmond and Henrico Railroad Company. We rely upon the wisdom and sanity of this branch of the municipal chamber to give this measure the calm and judicial consideration it demands. The rule that should guide their action should be an earnest endeavor to learn the vital significance of this proposed grant to the people of Richmond. No railroading without the closest scrutiny and investigation of the provisions of the franchise as framed should be permitted. Every citizens is looking to them to search out the true interests of the community and protect them to the end. No other question is before this body, but the welfare of the people they represent.

The facts upon which their decision must be based can be presented in a word. The sole question is whether the franchise will assure to the city better service in electric power or a cheaper rate for its present service. The individual aims of both companies do not constitute a basis for action. Unless it can be shown that the people of Richmond will be materially bettered by this new use of their streets there is no reason for running the risk of involving the city in litigation, expense and inconvenience. The matter is technical, but it is also in the last analysis one that can be separated into a few simple principles. The Aldermen are amply competent to decide this question upon its merits. They should take no second-hand evidence, and they should not disregard any source of enlightenment within their reach. The action of the Council is a warning. We expect the Aldermen to prove their sanity by at least learning the meaning of the measure they are asked to vote upon.

CHEESE PARING ECONOMY.

Discussing forest conservation and the toll in life and property value that has been exacted and is liable to be exacted by forest fires, Forest and Stream gives these among other salient facts: In 1910 seventy-nine fire fighters and twenty-five settlers were burned to death in the national forests, and $12,000,000 worth of timber was destroyed. There is now in these forests $2,000,000,000 worth of timber—public property—exposed to the danger of being swept out by besoms of flames, unless adequate steps for safeguarding it are taken. A system of safeguards already exists, it is true. It consists in building telephone lines, roads, fire lanes and trails for the quick summoning and transportation of fire fighters to points where fires may have broken out. But, comparatively speaking, the system is in the infancy of its development. It has accomplished much, but there are circumstances in which it can be easily understood it would be impotent—verily, as impotent as was King Canute in his command to the sea. The article in Forest and Stream is inspired by and is in condemnation of the cheese paring, false economy of Congress, which would not only not expand the system, as vitally demanded, but cripple it so far as it now obtains.

The Forest Service asked for this year an appropriation of $1,000,000 for "actual fire fighting," but the agricultural bill, as it passed the House, cut the amount down to one-fifth of the sum, despite the fact that it was designed to be an emergency appropriation that would neither be needed nor spent unless the fires occurred. That, however, is not all. The current appropriation for telephone line, trail, road construction, etc., is $500,000, and that was reduced to $275,000. This was done, as is learned from another source than Forest and Stream, notwithstanding that in 1910 disastrous fires which threatened the very existence of the vast woodland areas of Northern Idaho, Montana and Washington necessitated and compelled the expenditure of $900,000 plus the regular appropriation. How Congress can reconcile the wisdom of its "economy" and "saving to the people" with that exhibit is somewhat difficult to comprehend.

Addressing itself more especially to the "economy" of reducing the appropriation for extension of the quick summoning and transportation system, Forest and Stream declares—and it is not given to speaking unadvisedly on such matters—that before the national forests can be rendered even reasonably safe against fire they must have ten times the present trails and six times the telephone lines they now have. Then it presents a striking calculation, which would seem convincing to the most elementary reasoner, that the "economy" of Congress it is discussing affords a little less than ludicrous illustration of saving the people's money at the spigot and taking enormous risks of wasting it at the bung. "If," says our contemporary, "Congress gave the Forest Service the $500,000 a year it asks to build trails and telephone lines, it would give only ¼ of 1 per cent. of the value of the timber standing to-day in the national forests." The situation would be absolutely ludicrous were not the question so serious.

That such economy, nay, parsimony, is indefensible is further accentuated when we remember the relation of forest conservation to prevention of floods and the frightful destruction of property and frequent distressing loss of life from these. The headwaters of many of the streams that contributed to the recent appalling Mississippi Valley disaster make in the national forest reservations of the Northwest.

THE OTHER SHEEP.

(Selected for The Times-Dispatch.)

"And other sheep I have which are not of this fold; them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and there shall be one fold and one shepherd."—St. John x, 16.

Our text is a revelation of the spirit of Jesus and a declaration of the kind of spirit He desires to find in us; for to be a Christian is to be like Jesus Christ. In His holy word He tells us: "Ye shall be witnesses unto Me," thereby teaching us that our mission as his disciples, is to show His influence in our lives. The apostles were recognized as men who had been with Jesus, and that ought to be true of us by our showing we have His spirit. We are sent by Him to do His work and be His messengers, and this is true not only of the ministers of His Gospel, but of each and every one of us. Even as Jesus was always thinking about the other sheep, so must we. The parable of the one lost sheep represents His whole life. He came not only to call the righteous, but to bring sinners to repentance. He came to seek and to save the seemingly lost. Nothing appealed to Him more than need and helplessness.

Let us listen, then, to His great word. The Master is proclaiming one of the high purposes of His ministry—He must bring the other sheep. And this announcement He prefaces with the reason for it and follows with the result of it; He must bring the other sheep because all are His, and having brought them there shall be one fold and one shepherd. This points so strongly to the fact that Christ loves us all, the good and the bad may call Him Father, and in the end, if we will only try to follow Him, He will make all of one fold to be cared for by the Great Shepherd. There are so many in this world that seem without the fold, and yet they are His, and His love will bring them near in his own good time, if they will only trust in Him.

Jesus Christ cares for the people in heathen lands and for those who live in ignorance and sin and poverty, as well as for those the world sees more fortunate, and the wonder of it all, as well as the abiding comfort of it, is that His heart is large enough to have patience and love and sympathy for the great and the small, the rich and the poor, the wicked and the good, the clever and the foolish, and all we have to do is to believe His holy word, have faith in Him and "try His works to do."

The "masses" are not masses to God. He knows them each by himself. He declares that He is the "Good Shepherd" because He knows His sheep, and this includes "the other sheep."

All this seems so familiar and natural to us that we can scarcely realize how strange it seemed when Jesus began to teach and preach it. He was the first missionary. In those days the people were narrow and foolish in their desire to be exclusive. The very name "Pharisee" means one who is separate from others. They held themselves aloof from the other people, and it was considered that the privileged should have no dealings with the unprivileged. Their narrow lives knew nothing of that regard for "the other sheep" which Jesus taught and felt, and therefore their lives could not become enriched and broadened through sacrifice for others. There was no one to teach this love until Jesus came, and yet how it was needed.

The difficulty then, as now, with the people was to realize that we have any sheep outside the narrow folds of our own immediate circles. The difference between the reformer, the philanthropist, the friend of the people and the ordinary respectable but indifferent citizen, is largely a difference in the sense of responsibility. The indifferent citizen has no "other sheep." The wider relationship, patterned after the divine life of our Saviour, compels action. It obliges us to do something for others. It speaks in St. Paul's words: "Woe is me if I preach not the gospel; woe is me if I do not somehow share my privilege with the unprivileged. Them also must I bring."

Sometimes we wonder why our endeavors to help people meet with such scant success. One reason is that we do not undertake the difficult enterprise in His way. We do not speak in the voice of a friend. He attached great importance to the voice—He said they shall hear my voice and know it—and they did hear it. That, He pointed out, was one of the marks of the difference between the Good Shepherd and the other shepherds. The sheep know His voice and respond because it is the voice of a friend.

The essential thing in ministry to others is the fact of friendship. Therefore, no matter how differently we may be placed in life, we can work with all and for all in the great cause of Christ, uniting in the actual service of the Lord. This will bring us together here and help us to be ready for the time when there shall be one fold and one Shepherd.

In view of its past sessions there, the song of the Democratic National Convention ought to be "Back, Back to Baltimore."

WHAT IS THE MOST INTENSE HAPPINESS THAT A HUMAN CAN FEEL?

By John T. McCutcheon.

IS IT THIS?—"Well, Bill, you won't have to hang today. The Governor has signed your reprieve."

OR IS IT THIS?—"There! Your last tooth is filled and you won't have to come again for years."

OR IS IT THIS?—"Hooray, Charley! Your ticket has won the capital prize in the lottery!"

NO, IT IS THIS.

SIR GEORGE HOLFORD WILL WED RICH WIDOW

But He Will Not Resume Possession of Dorchester House.

BY LA MARQUISE DE FONTENOY.

SIR GEORGE HOLFORD, equerry to King George, is marrying a fairly rich widow, but she does not bring his sufficient wealth to make him wish to resume possession of Dorchester House, which he has rented on most advantageous terms to Whitelaw Reid for the entire duration of his mission as American Ambassador in London.

Of the great London mansions it is one of the most expensive to keep up, and for that reason remained "to let" from the date of the late Mrs. Holford's death until the present American envoy's occupancy.

I must not, however, forget that on the occasion of Queen Victoria's Golden Jubilee, Sir George placed it at the crown's disposal for the accommodation of some of the royal guests and delegates to the celebration. The government made the mistake of lodging there the Afghan Mission, which was headed by the half-brother of the present Ameer.

What with their rather careless habits, and especially their slaughtering of sheep in the fashion prescribed by the Mahommedan religion, in some of the great apartments, they made so much damage that it cost the State a good many thousands of pounds to put it again in order.

Dorchester House was built about sixty years ago by the late Robert S. Holford. He had inherited a fortune from an uncle, a miser who left, besides a vast accumulation of various kinds of property, an immense quantity of gold specie, which was found in the house on the Isle of Wight where he died.

Dorchester House occupies the site of a much older building, which belonged to the Earls of Dorchester, and is the nearest approach to a palace which Park Lane can show.

Splendidly furnished, its treasures of art include some priceless Turners, for which the late Mrs. Holford had a veritable passion, while the Rembrandts hung upon the wall of its picture gallery, are among the finest examples of that master's art.

The Holford's descent from an ancient Cheshire family. In Charles II.'s reign that removed to Gloucestershire, acquiring the Western Birt estate, measuring some 15,000 acres, and which has remained in their possession ever since, as their principal country seat. It is there that Sir George Holford will take his bride. The family in past days owed much of their wealth to the West India trade.

Sir George Holford was a captain in the First Life Guards when he became one of the equerries of the late Duke of Clarence. On the duke's death he joined the Household of Edward VII., then Prince of Wales, in a similar capacity, and has been continued in office by the present King. His mother was one of the Lindsays of Balcarres, and one of his sisters is Lady Grey, wife of the former Governor-General of Canada. He is a very good-looking man of fifty-two, with snowwhite hair and moustache, and is a nart conoisseur, as benefits a man whose art treasures have been estimated at over $10,000,000.

Indeed the fact that so much of his property is tied up in these totally unproductive collections, has rendered him far less rich than his predecessors.

He is rather reserved in manner, and shares with Joseph Chamberlain a fondness for orchids.

His bride, Mrs. Jack Menzies, who is not to be confused with Lord Saltoun's septuagenarian sister of the same name, is a daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Wilson of Tranby Croft fame; a sister, therefore, of Miss Muriel Wilson. On her marriage to the late Jack Menzies, she received from her father an allowance of $20,000 a year, and it is unlikely that this will be to any extent increased, judging from the way that her uncle, the late Lord Nunburnholme, dealt with his daughters. Like all the Wilson girls, she has her fair share of good looks, and taste in dress, but is no longer particularly young, as she was one of the memorable baccarat party at Tranby Croft which caused so great a sensation somewhat more than twenty years ago.

Through her first marriage she became connected with some American families. For Frederick W. Menzies, of the Second Life Guard Regiment, Jack Menzies's brother, is married to Miss Hetty Davenport, daughter of the late John Davenport, of New York, and a granddaughter of Gouverneur Morris.

Admiral Sir Archibald Berkeley Milne, who has just been appointed commander-in-chief of the English naval forces in the Mediterranean, was a particular favorite of King Edward VII. and of his consort. He was for a long time in command of the royal yachts. He is, however, no mere courtier, and has been a good deal of war service, both afloat and ashore, having been severely wounded at the battle of Ulundi, in South Africa, while acting as Naval A. D. C. to Lord Chelmsford.

He is a son of the late Admiral Sir Alexander Milne, who was for so many years one of the Lords of the Admiralty, and a grandson of that Admiral Sir David Milne who was second in command of Lord Exmouth's expedition against Algiers in the early days of the nineteenth century. Sir Archibald likewise took part in the Egyptian campaign, of 1882. He is principally known on this side of the Atlantic, however, in connection with an extraordinary encounter with William Waldorf Astor.

Sir Archibald, at the request of the Countess of Oxford, who was Miss Corbin, of New York, at whose house he had been dining, accompanied her to a concert given by W. W. Astor, at his house in Carlton House Terrace. On their arrival he was summarily requested by Mr. Astor to leave his house because he had not been asked by him. The episode was made worse by the Pall Mall Gazette containing, on the following day, an intimation to the effect that Captain Milne had appeared at Mr. Astor's house as an uninvited guest.

It is true that Mr. Astor had been provoked beyond all endurance by finding people whom he did not know from Adam frequenting his entertainments, abusing his hospitality, and ignoring him completely, and it was by a singular piece of misfortune that he should have happened to select so distinguished and popular an officer as Sir Archibald Milne as a scapegoat for the others. Mr. Astor subsequently apologized for the offensive paragraph in the Pall Mall Gazette, and all unpleasantness in connection with the affair was obliterated.

To what extent British peers are now embarking in business projects, in order to make up for Lloyd-George's heavy drain upon their resources—heretofore derived mainly from land—is shown by the will of the late Marquis of Waterford, probate of which has just been granted to the executor, his uncle, Lord Charles Beresford.

From this document it appears that Lord Waterford, who was head of the Beresford family, and who was drowned at his country seat, Curraghmore, having fallen into a deep stream from a rustic bridge in the dark, carried on a woollen manufacturing business at Kilmacthomas, a mineral water business at Dungarvan, and a brewers and malters trade at Dublin, each of which concerns is exceedingly profitable and yielded him a very handsome revenue. This is shown by the fact that the property on which death duties have been collected by the treasury from his heirs, amounts to considerably over $5,000,000.

The admiral, who is so well known in the United States, may be said to be in charge of nearly all the family fortunes, for besides being administrator of the estate of his grandnephew, the present Marquis of Waterford, who is a boy at school, and will not attain his majority for some seven or eight years, he is also guardian of the young son of his soldier brother, the late Colonel Lord William Beresford by his American wife, who was previously twice married, first to the late Louis Hamersley, of New York, and then to the late Duke of Marlborough.